

### Remarks

The Applicants confirm the earlier election of Claims 1 and 2. Claims 3 and 4 have been cancelled without prejudice and without disclaimer of the subject matter therein. The Applicants specifically reserve the right to file one or more divisional applications directed to that subject matter.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 as being incomplete. The Applicants have amended Claim 1 in particular so that it is complete and in compliance with §112, second paragraph. Claim 2 has also been amended for clarification purposes. Support for the amendments to Claims 1 and 2 may be found in paragraphs [0014], [0016]-[0019], [0021], [0024]-[0027] and [0030]. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 is objected to because of the use of colloquial terms. As mentioned above, the Applicants have amended Claim 2 to remove the colloquial term. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Morozumi. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's helpful comments applying Morozumi to Claim 1. The Applicants nonetheless respectfully submit that Morozumi is inapplicable. Reasons are set forth below.

Morozumi discloses a catalyst regenerating technique using fuel gas generated in gasification apparatus and processed at the gas reforming apparatus. Morozumi does not disclose fuel gas recirculation to the gasification apparatus. Morozumi also does not disclose measurement of tar in the fuel gas at a time when the temperature of the reforming apparatus is low.

In sharp contrast, the Applicants' specification in paragraphs [0004]-[0006] discloses that, when the reforming apparatus does not attain or has not attained the specific process temperature, various problems occur because of the tar. Claim 1 recites a biomass gasification system which takes measures against the tar in the period from start up of ordinary operation of the system in which the reforming device cannot thermally crack the tar at the low temperature. Morozumi is quite different because that system is only for the ordinary operation of the system in which the tar is suitably cracked. Morozumi does not disclose how the system is structured and operated for the tar within the fuel gas before the temperature of the reforming device rises the process temperature. In other words, there is, for example, a period of time between system start up and attainment of

ordinary operation of the system. Morozumi does not even recognize this. Therefore, Morozumi does not implicitly or explicitly disclose all of the features of Claim 1. Claim 1 recites the specific feature of the low temperature operation of the reforming device as described in the Applicants' specification in paragraph [0011]. Morozumi does not disclose this. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 based on Morozumi is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 USC §103 as being obvious over Morozumi. The Applicants again note with appreciation the Examiner's helpful comments with respect to hypothetically applying Morozumi to Claim 2. The Applicants nonetheless respectfully submit that Morozumi fails to provide disclosure, teachings or suggestions to one skilled in the art that would lead to the subject matter of Claim 2. There is nothing in Morozumi, as noted above, that provides any disclosure with respect to the Applicants' claimed aspect of providing a biomass gasification system which takes measures against the tar in the time period between the time of ordinary operation of the system in which the reforming device is fully operational. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that Morozumi is inapplicable to Claim 2. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury  
Reg. No. 31,750  
Attorney for Applicants

TDC/vbm  
(215) 656-3381